

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

lay

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/037,663 01/03/2002		01/03/2002	Mudit K. Jain	HRT-58192	1583	
24201	7590	02/11/2004	EXAMINER			
FULWID	ER PATT	ON LEE & UTEC	GIBSON, ROY DEAN			
		CENTER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
6060 CEN		/E	ARI UNII	PAPER NUMBER		
TENTH F			3739	Coo /		
LOS ANG	ELES, CA	A 90045		DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004	. 8 E.	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)	•				
		10/037,6	63	JAIN, MUDIT K.					
	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit					
	•	Roy D. G	ibson	3739					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the	correspondenc address					
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN unsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3) period for reply is specified above, the maximum stare to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are part of the provision of	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evalunication. O) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and verill, by statute, cause the app	rent, however, may a reply be ti tutory minimum of thirty (30) da vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron olication to become ABANDONI	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communi ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.				
Status									
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>17 November</i> 2	2003.	,					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5) [6) [7) [
Applicat	ion Papers								
9)□	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.							
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any obje	•	_	- ,					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	•		-	* *				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar						
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or er No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Pate Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3739

Entry of Amendment

Applicant's amendment filed on Nov. 17, 2003, as Paper No. 5, is acknowledged.

Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled and claims 45-50 have been added by the applicant, thus, claims 1-8 and 11-50 are currently pending.

Prior Rejections or Objections

The following comments pertain to the rejections or objections in the most recent Office action, Paper No. 3, mailed on May 2, 2003. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 102 and 103 are withdrawn, however, new grounds of rejection are presented below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-13, 16 and 18-19 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 11-13 and 16 and 18-19 recite the limitation "electrode system" in lines 1-

2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Examiner suggests these claims and claim 17 should depend from claim 2 to correct this. Note that if claims 11 and 12 depend form claim 2 they become duplicates of claims 3 and 4.

Art.Unit: 3739

Claim 44 recites the limitation "the assessment impedance and the reference impedance" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ben-Haim et al. (6,200,310). Ben-Haim et al. disclose a catheter comprising:

a shaft having a distal segment with a tissue-contacting area and a fluid contacting area;

a pressure sensor associated with the distal segment and inherently positioned within the tissue contacting area; at least one flow sensor (92) positioned within the fluid-contacting area; an electrode system (inherently part of an RF energy application applicator which is discloses as an alternative equivalent to a laser and which would be located at the distal segment) and inherently located adjacent the flow sensor (Figure 7A and col. 2, lines 16-25, col. 7, lines 39-59, col. 8, lines 40-54 and col. 9, lines 42-59).

Art. Unit: 3739

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Haim et al. The examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to locate the pressure sensor on or adjacent to the electrode as required by the surgical procedure and to additionally locate a temperature sensor (well known in the art) within the tissue-contacting area to provide the required temperature.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 20-43 and 45-50 are allowed.

Claims 5-8, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13, 16 and 18-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 44 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Page 5

Art Unit: 3739

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sun et al. (6,391,024) disclose an RF ablation apparatus with a plurality of electrodes at the distal segment and a means to visually displace the percent of electrode/tissue contact via the measurement of impedance rather than pressure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy D. Gibson whose telephone number is 703-308-3520. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30 am-4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 703-308-0994. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/037,663 Page 6

Art, Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roy D. Gibson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739

February 4, 2004